

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

10 KASI A. FOSS, )  
11 Plaintiff, ) No. CV-07-091-CI  
12 v. ) ORDER REMANDING CASE  
13 MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, ) TO THE COMMISSIONER  
14 Commissioner of Social )  
Security, )  
15 Defendant. )

---

16 **BEFORE THE COURT** are Plaintiff's Objections to the Report and  
17 Recommendation in the captioned matter. Plaintiff is represented by  
18 Maureen J. Rosette. Daphne Banay, Special Assistant U.S. Attorney,  
19 and Frank A. Wilson, Assistant U.S. Attorney, represent the  
20 Defendant.

21 The undersigned, having reviewed the file, the Report and  
22 Recommendation, the Objections and Response, concludes that claimant  
23 has met her burden of establishing step two's requirement of a  
24 "severe" impairment as to left arm pain and left ankle pain.  
25 Accordingly, the undersigned does not adopt the Report and  
26 Recommendation and concludes the ALJ's decision must be reversed.  
27 The captioned matter is remanded to the Commissioner with direction  
28

1 to evaluate Plaintiff's severe impairments beyond step two.<sup>1</sup> Although  
2 Plaintiff may not succeed in proving she is disabled, as defined by  
3 the Social Security Act, the ALJ lacked substantial evidence to find  
4 no medically severe impairment.

5 Judgment shall be entered for Plaintiff. An application for  
6 attorney fees may be filed by separate motion.

7 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

8 **DATED** this 5th day of February, 2008.

9  
10                         s/ Fred Van Sickle  
11                         Fred Van Sickle  
12                         United States District Judge

23                         

---

<sup>1</sup>Step two is "de minimis screening device [used] to dispose of  
24 groundless claims," *Smolen v. Chater*, 80 F.3d 1273, 1290 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir.  
25 1996); an ALJ may find that a claimant lacks medically severe  
26 impairments only when this conclusion is "clearly established by  
27 medical evidence." S.S.S.R. 85-28; see *Web v. Barnhart*, 443 F.3d  
28 683, 686-87 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2005).